arXiv:1401.3395v2 [nlin.SI] 19 Mar 2015

Combinatorial aspects of the conserved quantities of the tropical periodic Toda lattice

Taichiro Takagi

Department of Applied Physics, National Defense Academy, Kanagawa 239-8686, Japan

Abstract. The tropical periodic Toda lattice (trop p-Toda) is a dynamical system attracting attentions in the area of the interplay of integrable systems and tropical geometry. We show that the Young diagrams associated with trop p-Toda given by two very different definitions are identical. The first definition is given by a Lax representation of the discrete periodic Toda lattice, and the second one is associated with a generalization of the Kerov-Kirillov-Reshetikhin bijection in the combinatorics of the Bethe ansatz. By means of this identification, it is shown for the first time that the Young diagrams given by the latter definition are preserved under time evolution. This result is regarded as an important first step in clarifying the iso-level set structure of this dynamical system in general cases, i. e. not restricted to generic cases.

1. Introduction

The Toda lattice is one of the most famous integrable systems in classical mechanics [1]. Recently, one of its variations is attracting attentions in the context of connections between tropical geometry and integrable systems [2]. We call this system the tropical periodic Toda lattice (trop p-Toda) [3, 4, 5]. Its evolution equation was known as the ultra-discretization of the discrete periodic Toda equation [6]. In [7, 8], Inoue and Takenawa studied this system and clarified its iso-level set structure under a certain condition which they call *generic*. From the viewpoint of tropical geometry, this condition is related to the smoothness of the tropical spectral curve determined by the conserved quantities of the system.

In this paper we study conserved quantities of trop p-Toda without the generic condition. In particular, we show that the Young diagrams associated with trop p-Toda given by two very different definitions are identical. From one of the definitions one immediately sees that the common Young diagram is preserved under time evolution. In the context of integrable cellular automaton explained below, this Young diagram represents the content of solitons in the system, and the generic condition is requiring no two solitons have a common amplitude. We believe that this identification of the Young diagrams is the first step to clarify the iso-level set structure of this dynamical system in *general* cases, i. e. not restricted to *generic* cases.

The two definitions of the Young diagrams are as follows. The first is related to Lax representation of the discrete periodic Toda lattice (dp-Toda). Here the kth conserved quantity of dp-Toda is defined as a sum of products of k dependent variables whose indices obey a nearest-neighbor-exclusion condition. Then the corresponding conserved quantity of trop p-Toda is defined as its tropical limit or *tropicalization* [9, 10, 11]. We show that the above condition leads to a condition of weak convexity relating the conserved quantities, which is also a new result of this paper that enables us to represent them as a Young diagram. The second is related to a generalization of the Kerov-Kirillov-Reshetikhin (KKR) bijection in combinatorics of Bethe ansats [12, 13], especially one of its variations in $\mathfrak{sl}_2$ case [14]. It is also considered as a continuous analogue of the '10-elimination' algorithm for conserved quantities of an integrable cellular automaton known as the periodic box-ball system (pBBS) [15].

We note that for a special case there has already been attention paid to this remarkable equivalence of Young diagrams. The pBBS is regarded as a case of trop p-Toda, where the values of its dependent variables are restricted to positive integers. In this case, the equivalence of the Young diagrams has been pointed out by Iwao and Tokihiro [16]. On the basis of their idea of drawing diagrams associated with the second definition of the Young diagram, we give a proof of our main theorem for the conserved quantities of general trop p-Toda.

Here we explain the reason why we expect that the identification of the Young diagrams from Lax representation and those from generalized KKR bijection is the first step to clarify the iso-level set structure of trop p-Toda without the generic condition. In the pBBS case, the KKR bijection gives the action-angle variables of this dynamical system [17]. While the action variables are the conserved quantities, the angle variables yield certain time evolutions which turn out to be flows on the iso-level set. By this fact the author has succeeded to clarify the iso-level set structure of pBBS without the generic condition [18]. Since the trop p-Toda is a generalization of the pBBS, it is reasonable to consider the corresponding generalization of the KKR bijection. We note that in the pBBS case the conservation of the Young diagrams defined by KKR bijection is directly proved by using the crystal theory, combinatorial R maps, and Yang-Baxter relations (See Theorem 2.2 and Proposition 3.4 of [17]). Since these methods are not developed in trop p-Toda case, our main result of this paper is so far the only proof of the conservation of the Young diagrams defined by the generalized KKR.

Readers may wonder why trop p-Toda is worth studying independently of the already known many results in pBBS. The most remarkable difference between pBBS and trop p-Toda is that the iso-level set of the latter is not a finite set but is an algebraic variety. This implies that while any state comes back to the same state in pBBS, that is not true in trop p-Toda. Actually, when the lengths of the solitons are linearly independent over the field of rational numbers, the phase flow can be dense in the iso-level set as in the case of classical mechanics [19]. However, this is nothing but only one aspect of the fact that their iso-level sets are totally different mathematical objects. A really important problem here is that the structure of the iso-level set of trop

p-Toda has not yet been fully clarified in general. As we have mentioned, it has been clarified only in the case when it reduces to a real torus under the generic condition. Without this condition, we have no suitable description of their connected components or invariant tori, which have different sizes according to their internal symmetries. We expect that they should not be regarded as mere subsets as in the pBBS case [18], but should be regarded as lower dimensional tori embedded in the whole iso-level set. The present work is a starting point to developing such a description, which will contribute to making progress in the studies on tropical geometry and integrable systems.

This paper is organized as follows. In §2.1 we derive the nearest neighbor exclusion condition on the indices of variables from a determinant formula of a matrix. In §2.2 definitions of dp-Toda and trop p-Toda are given, and we show that the matrix given above is related to the Lax matrix of dp-Toda. Here we obtain conserved quantities of dp-Toda and trop p-Toda by the formulae described by the nearest neighbor exclusion condition. In §2.3 we show that the conserved quantities of trop p-Toda are in weak convexity condition (Theorem 9), which enables us to describe the conserved quantities as a Young diagram. In §2.4 another algorithm to construct the Young diagram is introduced, and the main result of this paper (Theorem 13) is presented. We devote our efforts to proving this theorem in §3. In §3.1 we introduce an algorithm to draw diagrams of trees that visualizes the algorithm in §2.4. In §3.2 some elementary lemmas on the properties of the diagrams are presented. Using these lemmas, we give a proof of the main theorem in §3.3, leaving proofs of two more lemmas which we call Close Packing Lemma and Forest Realization Lemma. We devote our efforts to proving these lemmas in §3.4 and §3.5. A continuous analogue of the KKR bijection is discussed in §4. Some concluding remarks are given in §5.

2. Discrete and tropical periodic Toda lattice

2.1. Determinant formulas and the nearest neighbor exclusion condition

Throughout this paper we use the symbol $\lhd$ by the following meaning:

$$i \lhd j \Leftrightarrow i+1 < j. \tag{1}$$

Given a sequence of real numbers $a_0(=0), a_1, a_2, \ldots$, let $c_k^{(N)}$ be the numbers defined by the recursion relation

$$c_k^{(N)} = c_k^{(N-1)} + (a_{2N-1} + a_{2N}) c_{k-1}^{(N-1)} - a_{2N-2} a_{2N-1} c_{k-2}^{(N-2)}, \tag{2}$$

and the boundary conditions

$$c_k^{(N)} = 0 \quad \text{for } k < 0 \quad \text{or} \quad k > N, \qquad c_0^{(N)} = 1 \quad \text{for } N \geq 0. \tag{3}$$

Then it is easy to see that the unique solution of (2) under (3) is given by

$$c_k^{(N)} = \sum_{1 \leq i_1 \lhd i_2 \lhd \cdots \lhd i_k \leq 2N} a_{i_1} a_{i_2} \cdots a_{i_k}. \tag{4}$$

Let $e_k^{(N)}$ be the numbers defined by the relations

$$e_1^{(N)} = c_1^{(N)}, \qquad e_2^{(N)} = c_2^{(N)} - a_1 a_{2N}, \tag{5}$$

$$e_k^{(N)} = c_k^{(N)} - a_1 a_{2N} \sum_{3 \le i_1 \lhd i_2 \lhd \cdots \lhd i_{k-2} \le 2N-2} a_{i_1} a_{i_2} \dots a_{i_{k-2}}, \tag{6}$$

for $3 \le k \le N$. Then it is easy to see that

$$e_k^{(N)} = \sum_{\substack{1 \le i_1 \lhd i_2 \lhd \cdots \lhd i_k \le 2N \\ (i_1, i_k) \ne (1, 2N)}} a_{i_1} a_{i_2} \dots a_{i_k}. \tag{7}$$

Let $F_1(x; a_1, a_2) = x + a_1 + a_2$ and

$$F_N(x; a_1, \dots, a_{2N}) = \det \begin{pmatrix} x + a_1 + a_2 & 1 & & & \\ a_2 a_3 & x + a_3 + a_4 & 1 & & \\ & a_4 a_5 & \ddots & \ddots & \\ & & \ddots & \ddots & 1 \\ & & & a_{2N-2} a_{2N-1} & x + a_{2N-1} + a_{2N} \end{pmatrix}, \tag{8}$$

for $N \ge 2$.

Lemma 1 ([20], Proposition 7.1)

$$F_N(x; a_1, \dots, a_{2N}) = \sum_{k=0}^{N} c_k^{(N)} x^{N-k}. \tag{9}$$

Proof. Let $F_N(x; a_1, \dots, a_{2N}) = \sum_{k=0}^{N} b_k^{(N)} x^{N-k}$. Then we have $b_0^{(N)} = 1$. By expanding (8) with respect to its Nth row one obtains

$$\begin{aligned} F_N(x; a_1, \dots, a_{2N}) &= (x + a_{2N-1} + a_{2N}) F_{N-1}(x; a_1, \dots, a_{2N-2}) \\ &\quad - a_{2N-2} a_{2N-1} F_{N-2}(x; a_1, \dots, a_{2N-4}). \end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

Defining $b_k^{(N)} = 0$ for $k < 0$ or $k > N$, one can deduce from (10) that the $b_k^{(N)}$'s satisfy the same recursion relation (2) as $c_k^{(N)}$'s for $1 \le k \le N$. Hence $b_k^{(N)} = c_k^{(N)}$. □

Let

$$G_N(x; a_1, \dots, a_{2N}) = \det \begin{pmatrix} x + a_1 + a_2 & 1 & & & (-1)^{N-1} a_1 a_{2N} / y \\ a_2 a_3 & x + a_3 + a_4 & 1 & & \\ & a_4 a_5 & \ddots & \ddots & \\ & & \ddots & \ddots & 1 \\ (-1)^{N-1} y & & & a_{2N-2} a_{2N-1} & x + a_{2N-1} + a_{2N} \end{pmatrix}, \tag{11}$$

for $N \ge 3$.

Lemma 2

$$G_N(x; a_1, \dots, a_{2N}) = y + (\prod_{i=1}^{2N} a_i)/y + \sum_{k=0}^{N} e_k^{(N)} x^{N-k}. \tag{12}$$

Proof. By expanding (11) with respect to its Nth column one obtains

$$\begin{aligned} G_N(x;a_1,\dots,a_{2N}) &= (x+a_{2N-1}+a_{2N})F_{N-1}(x;a_1,\dots,a_{2N-2}) \\ &\quad + y - a_{2N-2}a_{2N-1}F_{N-2}(x;a_1,\dots,a_{2N-4}) \\ &\quad + (a_1\dots a_{2N})/y - a_1a_{2N}F_{N-2}(x;a_3,\dots,a_{2N-2}) \\ &= F_N(x;a_1,\dots,a_{2N}) - a_1a_{2N}F_{N-2}(x;a_3,\dots,a_{2N-2}) \\ &\quad + y + (a_1\dots a_{2N})/y, \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

where we have used (10). Let $G_N(x;a_1,\dots,a_{2N}) = y + (\prod_{i=1}^{2N} a_i)/y + \sum_{k=0}^{N} g_k^{(N)} x^{N-K}$. From Lemma 1 and (13), one finds that the $g_k^{(N)}$'s satisfy the same relations, (5) and (6), as the $e_k^{(N)}$'s for $1 \le k \le N$. Hence $g_k^{(N)} = e_k^{(N)}$. □

2.2. The evolution equation and Lax representation

On the basis of [3], we briefly review the derivation of discrete and tropical periodic Toda lattice equations. Let $\{x_n(t)\}_{n\in\mathbb{Z}_N}$ be a set of smooth functions of time $t \in \mathbb{R}$. Set $a_{2n} = a_{2n}(t) := 1 + \delta\dot{x}_n(t), a_{2n+1} = a_{2n+1}(t) := \delta^2 e^{x_{n+1}(t)-x_n(t)}$ with $\delta > 0$ and $\bar{a}_j = a_j(t+\delta)$ for $j \in \mathbb{Z}_{2N}$. Then we have $\lim_{\delta\to 0} \frac{1}{\delta^3}(\bar{a}_{2n}\bar{a}_{2n+1} - a_{2n+1}a_{2n+2}) = 0$. Suppose $x_n = x_n(t)$'s satisfy the Toda lattice equation

$$\ddot{x}_n = e^{x_{n+1}-x_n} - e^{x_n - x_{n-1}}. \tag{14}$$

Then we have $\lim_{\delta\to 0} \frac{1}{\delta^2}(\bar{a}_{2n-1} + \bar{a}_{2n} - a_{2n} - a_{2n+1}) = 0$. Under this consideration, we define the evolution equations for the *discrete periodic Toda lattice* as

$$\bar{a}_{2n-1} + \bar{a}_{2n} = a_{2n} + a_{2n+1}, \quad \bar{a}_{2n}\bar{a}_{2n+1} = a_{2n+1}a_{2n+2}, \tag{15}$$

where the $a_n = a_n^t, \bar{a}_n = a_n^{t+1}$ are dependent variables which depend on discrete spatial coordinate $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{2N}$ and discrete time $t \in \mathbb{Z}$. Obviously, $\prod_{l=1}^{2N} a_l$ is a conserved quantity. By lemma 4 we will find that $h_N = \prod_{l=1}^{N} a_{2l-1} + \prod_{l=1}^{N} a_{2l}$ is also a conserved quantity. This implies that $(\prod_{l=1}^{N} \bar{a}_{2l-1}, \prod_{l=1}^{N} \bar{a}_{2l}) = (\prod_{l=1}^{N} a_{2l}, \prod_{l=1}^{N} a_{2l-1})$ or $(\prod_{l=1}^{N} a_{2l-1}, \prod_{l=1}^{N} a_{2l})$. While the former leads to the trivial solution $\bar{a}_n = a_{n+1}$, the latter to a non-trivial solution

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{a}_{2n} &= a_{2n+1} + a_{2n}\frac{1 - \prod_{l=1}^{N}(a_{2l-1}/a_{2l})}{\sum_{k=0}^{N-1}\prod_{l=1}^{k}(a_{2(n-l)+1}/a_{2(n-l)})}, \\ \bar{a}_{2n+1} &= a_{2n+1}a_{2n+2}/\bar{a}_{2n}. \end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

For a derivation of this solution, see Proposition 6.13 of [3]. Now we consider its tropicalization, which is a procedure to replace $\times$ by $+$, and $+$ by min. Note that the numerator in (16) is a conserved quantity. By regarding it as a positive constant and setting it to be zero under the *tropicalization with trivial valuation* [11], we obtain a dynamical system given by the piecewise linear evolution equations

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{A}_{2n} &= \min\left(A_{2n+1}, A_{2n} - \min_{0\le k\le N-1}\left(\sum_{l=1}^{k}(A_{2(n-l)+1} - A_{2(n-l)})\right)\right), \\ \bar{A}_{2n+1} &= A_{2n+1} + A_{2n+2} - \bar{A}_{2n}, \end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

on the phase space $\mathcal{T} = \left\{ (A_n)_{n\in\mathbb{Z}_{2N}} \;\middle|\; \sum_{l=1}^{N} A_{2l} < \sum_{l=1}^{N} A_{2l-1} \right\} \subset \mathbb{R}^{2N}$. We call this system *the tropical periodic Toda lattice* [3].

Remark 3 *We have changed the notations as* $a_{2n-2} = q_n, a_{2n-1} = w_n, A_{2n-2} = Q_n, A_{2n-1} = W_n$ *from those in [3], since this enables us to describe the conserved quantities neatly.*

Without loss of generality, we can assume all the A-variables in (17) take their values in $\mathbb{R}_{>0}$. This enables us to represent the time evolution of trop p-Toda by a sequence of two-colored (white and black) strips, where the lengths of the white (resp. black) segments are denoted by A_{2n-1}s (resp. A_{2n}s). See Figure 1 for an example.



Figure 1. A representation for the time evolution of trop p-Toda. Let t be the time for the top row, where the lengths of three black segments ('solitons') are A_2^t, A_4^t, A_6^t, and the lengths of white segments between them (with regard to the periodic boundary) are A_3^t, A_5^t, A_1^t. In the second row the length of the first black segment to the right of the j-th 'soliton' at time t is A_{2j}^{t+1}. In the same way, the strip at the n-th row visualizes the quantities A_j^{t+n-1}.

Now on the basis of [7] we briefly review the Lax representation for the discrete periodic Toda lattice equation. Let

$$R(\lambda) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & & & & a_1/\lambda \\ a_3 & 1 & & & \\ & a_5 & \ddots & & \\ & & \ddots & 1 & \\ & & & a_{2N-1} & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \; M(\lambda) = \begin{pmatrix} a_2 & 1 & & & \\ & a_4 & 1 & & \\ & & \ddots & \ddots & \\ & & & a_{2N-2} & 1 \\ \lambda & & & & a_{2N} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (18)$$

We denote by $\overline{R}(\lambda), \overline{M}(\lambda)$ the matrices obtained from $R(\lambda), M(\lambda)$ by replacing a_i by $\bar{a}_i$ for all i. Then the evolution equations of the discrete periodic Toda lattice (15) are equivalent to $\overline{R}(\lambda)\overline{M}(\lambda) = M(\lambda)R(\lambda)$. Let $L(\lambda) = R(\lambda)M(\lambda), \overline{L}(\lambda) = \overline{R}(\lambda)\overline{M}(\lambda)$.

Then we have the Lax representation for the discrete periodic Toda lattice as

$$\overline{L}(\lambda) = M(\lambda)L(\lambda)M(\lambda)^{-1}. \tag{19}$$

This implies that the polynomial $\det(x\mathbb{I} + L(\lambda))$ is invariant under the time evolution. Hence its coefficients are conserved quantities. Since $G_N(x; a_1, \ldots, a_{2N})$ in (11) is expressed as $G_N(x; a_1, \ldots, a_{2N}) = \det(x\mathbb{I} + L((-1)^{N-1}y))$ we have the following:

Lemma 4 *The discrete periodic Toda lattice* (15) *has* $N+1$ *conserved quantities*

$$h_k = \sum_{\substack{1 \le i_1 \lhd i_2 \lhd \cdots \lhd i_k \le 2N \\ (i_1, i_k) \ne (1, 2N)}} a_{i_1} a_{i_2} \ldots a_{i_k},$$

for $1 \le k \le N$ *and* $h_{N+1} = \prod_{i=1}^{2N} a_i$.

By means of their tropicalization we obtain:

Lemma 5 *The tropical periodic Toda lattice* (17) *has* $N+1$ *conserved quantities*

$$H_k = \min_{\substack{1 \le i_1 \lhd i_2 \lhd \cdots \lhd i_k \le 2N \\ (i_1, i_k) \ne (1, 2N)}} \left(A_{i_1} + A_{i_2} + \cdots + A_{i_k} \right), \tag{20}$$

for $1 \le k \le N$ *and* $H_{N+1} = \sum_{i=1}^{2N} A_i$.

Proof. As was explained in §4.1 of [3], the tropicalization can be realized as a concrete limiting procedure. In the present setting we let $a_i = e^{-A_i/\varepsilon}$ with $\varepsilon > 0$, apply the map $x \mapsto -\varepsilon \log x$ and take the limit $\varepsilon \to 0$. This procedure transforms (16) to (17), which implies the claim of this lemma of the basis of the previous one. □

Remark 6 *We derived Lemmas 4 and 5 directly through the Lax representation. An equivalent result was obtained by using a different method in [16], Proposition 3.9.*

2.3. The weak convexity condition relating the conserved quantities

The iso-level set structure of trop p-Toda has been clarified by means of tropical geometry [7, 8] in case when the *strong convexity condition* $H_k + H_{k+2} > 2H_{k+1}$ (which they call generic) is satisfied by the conserved quantities. In this section we prove that in general cases only the *weak convexity condition* $H_k + H_{k+2} \ge 2H_{k+1}$ holds. For this purpose we first consider a lemma in elementary combinatorics.

Put two kinds of symbols ∘'s and •'s on a circle. Say two ∘'s are *adjacent* if there are no other ∘'s between them.

Lemma 7 *Put* k ∘*'s and* $k+2$ •*'s on a circle so that their positions do not coincide and there are at most two* •*'s between adjacent* ∘*'s. Then on the circle we always have such a configuration* $- \bullet - \bullet - (\circ - \bullet)^n - \bullet -$ *for some* $n \ge 1$.

Proof. If there exist more than one $\circ$'s between any adjacent $\bullet$'s on the circle, remove the $\circ$'s until there remains only one. Suppose the number of $\circ$'s we have removed is α. Since the number of $\circ$ is now $k-\alpha$, the number of the configuration $-\bullet-\bullet-$ on the circle is $(k+2)-(k-\alpha)=\alpha+2$. By construction, we have such configurations $-\bullet-\bullet-(\circ-\bullet)^n-\bullet-$ for some $n\geq 1$ between all $(\alpha+2)$ adjacent $-\bullet-\bullet-$'s, and at least two of them will be left unchanged when we put all (α) removed $\circ$'s back into the original positions. □

Example 8 *See Figure 2.*



Figure 2. Examples for Lemma 7

Now we present one of our new results in this paper.

Theorem 9 *For* $x=(x_1,\ldots,x_{2N})\in(\mathbb{R}_{>0})^{2N}$ *let* $H_0(x)=0$ *and*

$$H_k(x)=\min_{\substack{1\leq i_1\lhd i_2\lhd\cdots\lhd i_k\leq 2N\\(i_1,i_k)\neq(1,2N)}}(x_{i_1}+x_{i_2}+\cdots+x_{i_k}), \tag{21}$$

for $1\leq k\leq N$. *Then the relations* $H_k(x)+H_{k+2}(x)\geq 2H_{k+1}(x)$ *are satisfied for* $0\leq k\leq N-2$.

Proof. Suppose we have $H_k(x)=x_{i_1}+\cdots+x_{i_k}$ and $H_{k+2}(x)=x_{j_1}+\cdots+x_{j_{k+2}}$. Let $S_1=\{i_1,\ldots,i_k\}$ and $S_2=\{j_1,\ldots,j_{k+2}\}$ be the sets of their indices. To begin with we assume $S_1\cap S_2=\emptyset$. For $a,b\in\{1,\ldots,2N\}$ say b is **next to** a if $|a-b|=1$ or $2N-1$. If there exists $b\in S_2$ such that b is not next to a for any $a\in S_1$, then we have $H_k(x)+x_b\geq H_{k+1}(x)$ and $H_{k+2}(x)-x_b\geq H_{k+1}(x)$. Hence the claim follows.

Suppose otherwise, i. e. we assume every $b\in S_2$ is next to some $a\in S_1$. Draw a circle of circumference $2N$ with a spacial coordinate $1,\ldots,2N$ assigned counter-clockwise on it. Put $\circ$'s on the circle at the positions given by S_1, and put $\bullet$'s at those given by S_2. Since every $b\in S_2$ is next to some $a\in S_1$, there exist at most two $\bullet$'s between adjacent

$\circ$'s on the circle. Hence by Lemma 7 we have such a configuration $-\bullet-\bullet-(\circ-\bullet)^n-\bullet-$ for some $n \geq 1$ on the circle. Replace this configuration by $-\bullet-\circ-(\bullet-\circ)^n-\bullet-$. Now let I_1 (resp. I_2) be the set of the positions of $\circ$'s (resp. $\bullet$'s) on the circle. Then since $|I_1| = |I_2| = k+1$ we have $H_k(x) + H_{k+2}(x) = \sum_{i \in I_1} x_i + \sum_{i \in I_2} x_i \geq 2H_{k+1}(x)$.

When $S_1 \cap S_2 \neq \emptyset$ but not $S_1 \subset S_2$, we can prove the statement by replacing S_i by $S_i \setminus (S_1 \cap S_2)$ for $i = 1, 2$ and repeating the above arguments. This is because no elements of $S_1 \cap S_2$ are next to any $a \in S_i \setminus (S_1 \cap S_2)$ for $i = 1, 2$. The case $S_1 \subset S_2$ is simpler, because no elements of $S_2 \setminus S_1$ are next to any $a \in S_1$. The proof is completed. □

Recall the conserved quantity of the tropical periodic Toda lattice (20). Let $\tilde{l}_i = H_{N+1-i} - H_{N-i}$ for $1 \leq i \leq N$. Then by Theorem 9 we have $\tilde{l}_1 \geq \cdots \geq \tilde{l}_N > 0$. Let $\{l_i\}_{1 \leq i \leq s}$ be the set of real numbers satisfying $l_1 > \cdots > l_s$ such that for any $1 \leq j \leq N$ there exists $1 \leq i \leq s$ such that $\tilde{l}_j = l_i$. And let $m_i = \#\{j | 1 \leq j \leq N, \tilde{l}_j = l_i\}$. Now we can express the conserved quantities by a Young diagram (Figure 3) in which the lengths of the horizontal edges are not necessarily integers.



Figure 3. The Young diagram.

In the context of integrable cellular automaton, this Young diagram represents the content of solitons in the system. From this point of view, we have m_i solitons of amplitude l_i for $1 \leq i \leq s$. We note that the lengths of the black segments in Figure 1 are not always identical to the amplitudes of solitons represented by λ, since there are intermediate states of collisions of several solitons.

2.4. Another algorithm for the Young diagram and the main theorem

We introduce another algorithm to construct Young diagrams from states of trop p-Toda. This algorithm is related to the KKR bijection in $\mathfrak{sl}_2$ case which was applied to the inverse scattering transform of pBBS [17]. It is also regarded as a continuous analogue of the '10-elimination' procedure [15]. We shall prove that the Young diagram

obtained here coincides with the one that was defined in the previous subsection.

Say any sequence of nonnegative real numbers $x_1, \ldots, x_{2n}$ obeys the *highest weight condition* if the inequalities

$$\sum_{i=1}^{k}(x_{2i-1} - x_{2i}) \geq 0, \tag{22}$$

are satisfied for $1 \leq k \leq n$. Fix time t and denote the dependent variables of trop p-Toda A_i^t by A_i. By shifting their indices cyclically, one can make the sequence $A_1, \ldots, A_{2N}$ obey the highest weight condition. This is due to the phase space condition under (17); suppose that we have this.

Let $x^{(1)} = (x_1^{(1)}, \ldots, x_{2N^{(1)}}^{(1)})$ with $x_i^{(1)} = A_i$ and $N^{(1)} = N$. Given an array of positive real numbers $x^{(i)} = (x_1^{(i)}, \ldots, x_{2N^{(i)}}^{(i)})$ satisfying the highest weight condition, define $y^{(i)} = (y_1^{(i)}, \ldots, y_{2N^{(i)}}^{(i)})$ by $y_j^{(i)} = x_j^{(i)} - \mu^{(i)}$ where $\mu^{(i)} = \min_{1 \leq j \leq 2N^{(i)}}\{x_j^{(i)}\}$. In the array of non-negative real numbers $y_1^{(i)}, \ldots, y_{2N^{(i)}}^{(i)}$, suppose there are $k^{(i)}$ sequences of zeros. Here we regard a lone zero also as a sequence. We denote by $n_j^{(i)}$ $(1 \leq j \leq k^{(i)})$ the length of the jth sequence of zeros. Let $N^{(i+1)} = N^{(i)} - \sum_{j=1}^{k^{(i)}} \lceil n_j^{(i)}/2 \rceil$ where $\lceil c \rceil$ is the smallest integer satisfying $\lceil c \rceil \geq c$. If $N^{(i+1)} = 0$ then we stop. Otherwise we define an array $x^{(i+1)} = (x_1^{(i+1)}, \ldots, x_{2N^{(i+1)}}^{(i+1)})$ of positive real numbers satisfying the highest weight condition by the following procedure.

(i) If the first sequence of $n_1^{(i)}$ zeros in the array $y_1^{(i)}, \ldots, y_{2N^{(i)}}^{(i)}$ is at the left end, then remove these zeros. We see that $n_1^{(i)}$ must be even because the array satisfies the highest weight condition

(ii) For any j such that the j-th sequence of $n_j^{(i)}$ zeros is between positive neighbors a, b as $\ldots, a, 0, \ldots, 0, b, \ldots$, replace it by $\ldots, a, b, \ldots$ if $n_j^{(i)}$ is even, or by $\ldots, a+b, \ldots$ if $n_j^{(i)}$ is odd. More precisely, we simply remove $n_j^{(i)}$ zeros in the former, or in the latter we further replace the neighbors a, b by a single number $a + b$.

(iii) Suppose the last sequence of $n_{k^{(i)}}^{(i)}$ zeros is at the right end after a positive neighbor a as $\ldots, a, 0, \ldots, 0$. Remove these zeros. If $n_{k^{(i)}}^{(i)}$ is odd then also remove a, and add it to the first element of the array.

Let $x_j^{(i+1)}$ be the jth element of the resulting array of $2N^{(i+1)}$ positive integers. By the following lemma we see that the sequence $x_1^{(i+1)}, \ldots, x_{2N^{(i+1)}}^{(i+1)}$ satisfies the highest weight condition.

Lemma 10 *The highest weight condition is preserved under the following procedures.*

(i) Insert or remove two consecutive zeros.

(ii) Split any positive term into two positive numbers and insert a zero between them, or remove a zero and join its neighbors into one term.

Suppose $N^{(i)} > 0$ for $1 \leq i \leq u$ and $N^{(u+1)} = 0$. Let $\nu^{(i)} = N^{(i)} - N^{(i+1)}$. Obviously the set of numbers $\{(\mu^{(i)}, \nu^{(i)})\}_{1 \leq i \leq u}$ determines a Young diagram $\tilde{\lambda}$ in which the lengths of the horizontal edges are positive real numbers (Figure 4).



Figure 4. The Young diagram.

Example 11 *For $N = 6$, let $A_1 = 2\sqrt{2}, A_2 = A_{12} = 2, A_3 = A_8 = A_{11} = \sqrt{2}, A_4 = A_5 = A_6 = A_7 = A_9 = A_{10} = 1$. Then we have:*

$$\begin{aligned}
x^{(1)} &= (2\sqrt{2}, 2, \sqrt{2}, 1, 1, 1, 1, \sqrt{2}, 1, 1, \sqrt{2}, 2),\\
y^{(1)} &= (2\sqrt{2}-1, 1, \sqrt{2}-1, 0, 0, 0, 0, \sqrt{2}-1, 0, 0, \sqrt{2}-1, 1),\\
x^{(2)} &= (2\sqrt{2}-1, 1, \sqrt{2}-1, \sqrt{2}-1, \sqrt{2}-1, 1),\\
y^{(2)} &= (\sqrt{2}, 2-\sqrt{2}, 0, 0, 0, 2-\sqrt{2}),\\
x^{(3)} &= (\sqrt{2}, 4-2\sqrt{2}),\\
y^{(3)} &= (3\sqrt{2}-4, 0),
\end{aligned}$$

and $\mu^{(1)} = 1, \mu^{(2)} = \sqrt{2}-1, \mu^{(3)} = 4-2\sqrt{2}, \nu^{(1)} = 3, \nu^{(2)} = 2, \nu^{(3)} = 1$.

Example 12 *For $N = 4$, let $A_1 = 4, A_2 = A_3 = 3, A_4 = A_5 = 2, A_6 = A_7 = A_8 = 1$. Then we have:*

$$\begin{aligned}
x^{(1)} &= (4, 3, 3, 2, 2, 1, 1, 1),\\
y^{(1)} &= (3, 2, 2, 1, 1, 0, 0, 0),\\
x^{(2)} &= (4, 2, 2, 1),\\
y^{(2)} &= (3, 1, 1, 0),\\
x^{(3)} &= (4, 1),\\
y^{(3)} &= (3, 0),
\end{aligned}$$

and $\mu^{(1)} = \mu^{(2)} = \mu^{(3)} = 1, \nu^{(1)} = 2, \nu^{(2)} = \nu^{(3)} = 1$.

Now we present the main result of this paper.

Theorem 13 *For any integer $1 \leq k \leq N$, the area of the part of the Young diagram $\tilde{\lambda}$ between its bottom line and the horizontal line above it at height k is given by H_k, the kth conserved quantity of the trop p-Toda defined as in* (20).

In other words, the Young diagram $\tilde{\lambda}$ in Figure 4 coincides with the Young diagram λ in Figure 3. We shall give a proof of this theorem in the next section.

3. Proof of the main theorem

3.1. Drawing a diagram of trees

By generalizing the method of Appendix A. 1 of [16], we introduce a way to draw a graph Φ_A associated with a state of the trop p-Toda $A = (A_1, \ldots, A_{2N})$. It has several connected components called trees. See Figure 5 for an example, that is for the A-variables in Example 11. At the end we rewrite the assertion of Theorem 13 in terms of the trees.

Recall the algorithm in §2.4 where $N = N^{(1)}$. Place the symbols $A_1, \ldots, A_{2N}$ or $x_1^{(1)}, \ldots, x_{2N^{(1)}}^{(1)}$ at a horizontal level, called level 0. Draw a vertical line from each symbol upwardly to a certain horizontal level, called level 1. We associate the non-negative real numbers $y_1^{(1)}, \ldots, y_{2N^{(1)}}^{(1)}$ to the lines. If $y_j^{(1)} = 0$, we put a symbol $\times$ at the top of the line. Then, change the symbol $\times$ into another symbol $\otimes$ if it is an isolated one, or is at an 'odd-th' position of a sequence of consecutive $\times$'s. In what follows we will pay attention to $\otimes$'s only and ignore the other $\times$'s. Each $\otimes$ is called the top of a tree of level 1. For each isolated $\otimes$ or sequence of $\otimes$'s placed at every other position, we let the lines adjacent to $\otimes$'s join together to straddle the $\otimes$'s. Here we respect the periodic boundary condition, so the leftmost and rightmost ends are regarded as adjacent. We call each joining point a branching point of level 1. After this procedure, the number of lines is reduced to $2N^{(2)}$.

Now we describe a general procedure to draw the diagram from level $i-1$ to level i. We associate the positive real numbers $x_1^{(i)}, \ldots, x_{2N^{(i)}}^{(i)}$ to the tops of the $2N^{(i)}$ lines at level $i-1$. Extend the lines upwardly to level i. We associate the non-negative real numbers $y_1^{(i)}, \ldots, y_{2N^{(i)}}^{(i)}$ to the lines. If $y_j^{(i)} = 0$, we put a symbol $\times$ at the top of the line. By repeating the same procedure in the previous paragraph, we obtain the tops of the trees, as well as the branching points, of level i.



Figure 5. A tree diagram for the A-variables

At the end we obtain a graph Φ_A for the state $A = (A_1, \ldots, A_{2N})$. Denote by $\boldsymbol{Tree}(\Phi_A)$ the set of all trees in the graph Φ_A. Define the level of a tree by the level of its top point marked by $\otimes$. By construction, the number of level i trees is $\nu^{(i)}$. Hence there are $\sum_{l=1}^{u} \nu^{(l)} = N$ trees in total. Let $t \in \boldsymbol{Tree}(\Phi_A)$ be a tree of level i. We define its height by $\mathrm{Ht}(t) = \sum_{l=1}^{i} \mu^{(l)}$.

Definition 14 *We label all the trees in $\boldsymbol{Tree}(\Phi_A)$ as $t_1, \ldots, t_N$ so that their heights are in weakly increasing order, i. e. $i < j \Rightarrow \mathrm{Ht}(t_i) \leq \mathrm{Ht}(t_j)$. Let $\mathrm{Tree}^{(k)} = \{t_1, \ldots, t_k\}$.*

Now we see that the assertion of Theorem 13 is equivalent to the relation

$$\sum_{i=1}^{k} \mathrm{Ht}(t_i) = \min_{\substack{1 \leq i_1 \lhd i_2 \lhd \cdots \lhd i_k \leq 2N \\ (i_1, i_k) \neq (1, 2N)}} (A_{i_1} + A_{i_2} + \cdots + A_{i_k}), \tag{23}$$

for $1 \leq k \leq N$.

3.2. Elementary lemmas

We present several elementary lemmas on the graph Φ_A that are necessary for proving Theorem 13. Given $t \in \boldsymbol{Tree}(\Phi_A)$, we define a set of indices of the A-variables as

$$\mathrm{Root}(t) = \{i \in \{1, \ldots, 2N\} | A_i \text{ is at a bottom point of } t\}. \tag{24}$$

For $T \subset \boldsymbol{Tree}(\Phi_A)$ we write $\mathrm{Root}(T) = \bigsqcup_{t \in T} \mathrm{Root}(t)$. If P is a branching point of t at level i, we define its height by $\mathrm{Ht}(P) = \sum_{l=1}^{i} \mu^{(l)}$. (Note that we regard a tree and a branching point of the same level as having common height, though they are not so depicted in figures for technical reasons.) Say P has multiplicity m_P if there are $m_P + 2$ lines outgoing from P. If the tree t has branching points $P_1, \ldots, P_q$ with multiplicities $m_{P_1}, \ldots, m_{P_q}$, define the weight of t by

$$\mathrm{wt}(t) = \mathrm{Ht}(t) + \sum_{j=1}^{q} \mathrm{Ht}(P_j) m_{P_j}. \tag{25}$$

Then we have:

Lemma 15 ([16], Lemma A.1) *For any $t \in \boldsymbol{Tree}(\Phi_A)$ it holds that*

$$\mathrm{wt}(t) = \sum_{i \in \mathrm{Root}(t)} A_i. \tag{26}$$

The set $\boldsymbol{Tree}(\Phi_A)$ becomes a partially ordered set on introducing the following partial order. Denote by $t \succ s$ when s is straddled by t. We denote by $t \succeq s$ a case where either $t \succ s$ or $t = s$ is satisfied. For $t \in \boldsymbol{Tree}(\Phi_A)$ we define

$$\mathrm{Sub}(t) = \{s \in \boldsymbol{Tree}(\Phi_A) | t \succ s\}, \tag{27}$$

$$\overline{\mathrm{Sub}}(t) = \{s \in \boldsymbol{Tree}(\Phi_A) | t \succeq s\} = \mathrm{Sub}(t) \sqcup \{t\}. \tag{28}$$

Each element of $\overline{\mathrm{Sub}}(t)$ takes either an 'odd-th' position or an 'even-th' position in its nesting structure, regarding t itself as taking the first position and the order of the nesting as increasing inwardly. We denote by $\overline{\mathrm{Sub}}_{\mathrm{o}}(t) \subset \overline{\mathrm{Sub}}(t)$ the set of all trees at odd-th positions, and let $\overline{\mathrm{Sub}}_{\mathrm{e}}(t) = \overline{\mathrm{Sub}}(t) \setminus \overline{\mathrm{Sub}}_{\mathrm{o}}(t)$. Accordingly, we define

$$\overline{\mathrm{Root}}_{\mathrm{o}}(t) = \mathrm{Root}(\overline{\mathrm{Sub}}_{\mathrm{o}}(t)), \tag{29}$$

$$\overline{\mathrm{Root}}_{\mathrm{e}}(t) = \mathrm{Root}(\overline{\mathrm{Sub}}_{\mathrm{e}}(t)), \tag{30}$$

and $\overline{\mathrm{Root}}(t) = \overline{\mathrm{Root}}_{\mathrm{o}}(t) \sqcup \overline{\mathrm{Root}}_{\mathrm{e}}(t)$. Then we have:

Lemma 16 ([16], Lemma A.2) *For any $t \in \boldsymbol{Tree}(\Phi_A)$ it holds that*

$$\sum_{s \in \overline{\mathrm{Sub}}(t)} \mathrm{Ht}(s) = \sum_{i \in \overline{\mathrm{Root}}_{\mathrm{o}}(t)} A_i. \tag{31}$$

We also use the following lemmas in the next subsection.

Lemma 17

$$\#\overline{\mathrm{Sub}}(t) = \#\overline{\mathrm{Root}}_{\mathrm{o}}(t). \tag{32}$$

Proof. Denote all the branching points in $\overline{\mathrm{Sub}}(t)$ by $P_1, \ldots, P_r$ and their multiplicities by $m_{P_1}, \ldots, m_{P_r}$. By looking the graph downwardly, we see that the number of trees increases by m at a branching point with multiplicity m. Hence $\#\overline{\mathrm{Sub}}(t) = 1 + \sum_{i=1}^{r} m_{P_i}$. In the same way, we see that the number of vertical lines increases by $2m$ at the branching point. Hence $\#\overline{\mathrm{Root}}(t) = 1 + \sum_{i=1}^{r} 2m_{P_i}$, which implies $\#\overline{\mathrm{Root}}_{\mathrm{o}}(t) = 1 + \sum_{i=1}^{r} m_{P_i}$. □

Recall the definition of the set $\mathrm{Tree}^{(k)}$ in Definition 14. One can prove the following lemma by induction on k.

Lemma 18 *For any $t \in \mathrm{Tree}^{(k)}$ the relation $\overline{\mathrm{Sub}}(t) \subset \mathrm{Tree}^{(k)}$ holds.*

Say ξ is a maximal element of a partially ordered set X if $\xi \succeq \xi'$ is satisfied for any $\xi' \in X$ that is comparable to ξ with respect to the partial order.

Definition 19 *Let $\mathrm{MTree}^{(k)} \subset \mathrm{Tree}^{(k)}$ be the set of all maximal elements of $\mathrm{Tree}^{(k)}$.*

Then we have:

Lemma 20

$$\bigsqcup_{t \in \mathrm{MTree}^{(k)}} \overline{\mathrm{Sub}}(t) = \mathrm{Tree}^{(k)}. \tag{33}$$

Proof. We show the inclusion $\subset$ since the opposite inclusion is almost trivial. Suppose u is an element of LHS. Then there exists $t \in \mathrm{MTree}^{(k)} \subset \mathrm{Tree}^{(k)}$ such that $u \in \overline{\mathrm{Sub}}(t)$. This implies $u \in \mathrm{Tree}^{(k)}$ by Lemma 18. □

Definition 21 *Let $\mathrm{MSub}(t) \subset \mathrm{Sub}(t)$ be the set of all maximal elements of $\mathrm{Sub}(t)$.*

Then it is easy to see that the following relations are satisfied:

$$\mathrm{Sub}(t) = \bigsqcup_{s \in \mathrm{MSub}(t)} \overline{\mathrm{Sub}}(s), \tag{34}$$

$$\overline{\mathrm{Root}_{\mathrm{e}}}(t) = \bigsqcup_{s \in \mathrm{MSub}(t)} \overline{\mathrm{Root}_{\mathrm{o}}}(s). \tag{35}$$

From (28), (34), (35) and Lemma 16 we have:

Lemma 22

$$\sum_{i \in \overline{\mathrm{Root}_{\mathrm{o}}}(t)} A_i = \mathrm{Ht}(t) + \sum_{i \in \overline{\mathrm{Root}_{\mathrm{e}}}(t)} A_i. \tag{36}$$

Let $t \in \boldsymbol{Tree}(\Phi_A)$ be a tree and $P \in t$ is one of its branching points. Consider a subtree $t_1 \subset t$ that extends downwardly from P. See Figure 6. Define $\mathrm{Root}(t_1), \mathrm{Sub}(t_1)$, etc. by extending the definitions (24), (27), etc. in an obvious way. Note that t_1 itself is not an element of $\boldsymbol{Tree}(\Phi_A)$. Then we have:

Lemma 23

$$\sum_{i \in \overline{\mathrm{Root}_{\mathrm{o}}}(t_1)} A_i \geqq \mathrm{Ht}(P) + \sum_{i \in \overline{\mathrm{Root}_{\mathrm{e}}}(t_1)} A_i. \tag{37}$$

Proof. If the subtree t_1 has branching points $Q_1, \ldots, Q_s$ with multiplicities $m_{Q_1}, \ldots, m_{Q_s}$, define its weight by

$$\mathrm{wt}(t_1) = \mathrm{Ht}(P) + \sum_{j=1}^{s} \mathrm{Ht}(Q_j) m_{Q_j}. \tag{38}$$

Then by the algorithm of drawing the graph Φ_A we can deduce $\mathrm{wt}(t_1) \leq \sum_{i \in \mathrm{Root}(t_1)} A_i$. We define $\bar{t}_1$ called the completion of t_1 as a tree obtained by extending the top of t_1 by the length $\sum_{i \in \mathrm{Root}(t_1)} A_i - \mathrm{wt}(t_1)$. In other words $\bar{t}_1$ is a tree that shares all the branching/bottom points with t_1 but satisfies Lemmas 15 and 16. Then the claim follows by applying Lemma 22 on the tree $\bar{t}_1$ and using $\mathrm{wt}(\bar{t}_1) \geq \mathrm{wt}(P)$. □

3.3. Proof of Theorem 13

Now we give a proof of the main theorem, leaving proofs of two more lemmas to appear afterwards in the following subsections.

Given N we define the sets of nearest neighbor excluding indices as

$$\mathcal{B}(k, N) = \{\{i_1, \ldots, i_k\} \subset \mathbb{Z}^k | 1 \leq i_1 \lhd i_2 \lhd \cdots \lhd i_k \leq 2N, (i_1, i_k) \neq (1, 2N)\}, \tag{39}$$

$$\mathcal{B}(N) = \bigsqcup_{1 \leqq k \leqq N} \mathcal{B}(k, N). \tag{40}$$

Then the RHS of (23) can be written as $\min_{B \in \mathcal{B}(k,N)} \{\sum_{i \in B} A_i\}$. The *Forest Realization Lemma* in §3.5 claims that for any $1 \leq k \leq N$ there exists $T \subset \boldsymbol{Tree}(\Phi_A)$ such that the relation

$$\min_{B \in \mathcal{B}(k,N)} \left\{ \sum_{i \in B} A_i \right\} = \sum_{i \in \mathrm{Root}(T)} A_i, \tag{41}$$



Figure 6. (left) The subtree t_1 defined as a branch of t under a branching point P: (right) A tree $\bar{t}_1$ defined as the completion of t_1

is satisfied. Then, from the *Close Packing Lemma* in §3.4 we can deduce that such T must be written by a disjoint union as

$$T = \bigsqcup_{t \in U} \overline{\mathrm{Sub}}_{\mathrm{o}}(t), \quad U \subset \boldsymbol{Tree}(\Phi_A). \tag{42}$$

This implies that

$$\sum_{i \in \mathrm{Root}(T)} A_i = \sum_{t \in U} \sum_{i \in \overline{\mathrm{Root}}_{\mathrm{o}}(t)} A_i = \sum_{t \in U} \sum_{s \in \overline{\mathrm{Sub}}(t)} \mathrm{Ht}(s) \geq \sum_{i=1}^{k} \mathrm{Ht}(t_i), \tag{43}$$

where we have used Lemma 16 and the relation $\sum_{t \in U} \#(\overline{\mathrm{Sub}}(t)) = k$ which was verified by Lemma 17. Hence it suffices to show that there exists $U \subset \boldsymbol{Tree}(\Phi_A)$ such that the relation

$$\bigsqcup_{t \in U} \overline{\mathrm{Sub}}(t) = \{t_1, \ldots, t_k\}, \tag{44}$$

is satisfied. By Lemma 20 one finds that this relation is satisfied when $U = \mathrm{MTree}^{(k)}$. This completes the proof of Theorem 13.

3.4. Close Packing Lemma

Recall that $\mathcal{B}(N) = \bigsqcup_{1 \leqq k \leqq N} \mathcal{B}(k, N)$ is the set of nearest neighbor excluding indices. Given $t \in \boldsymbol{Tree}(\Phi_A)$, take any $V \subset \overline{\mathrm{Sub}}(t)$ satisfying $t \in V$ and $\mathrm{Root}(V) \in \mathcal{B}(N)$. We say that V is *closely packed with respect to* t when $V = \overline{\mathrm{Sub}}_{\mathrm{o}}(t)$.

Lemma 24 *If V is not closely packed with respect to t, there exists $S \in \mathcal{B}(N)$ such that $S \subset \overline{\mathrm{Root}}(t), |S| = |\mathrm{Root}(V)|$ and $\sum_{i \in S} A_i < \sum_{i \in \mathrm{Root}(V)} A_i$.*

Proof. Let n be the order of the nesting of the trees in $\overline{\mathrm{Sub}}(t)$. We prove the lemma by induction on n. If $n = 1, 2$ one necessarily has $V = \overline{\mathrm{Sub}}_{\mathrm{o}}(t)$ so there is nothing to be proved. Suppose $n \geq 3$. Let $V^C = \overline{\mathrm{Sub}}(t) \setminus V$ and $a = \min \mathrm{Root}(\overline{\mathrm{Sub}}_{\mathrm{o}}(t) \cap V^C)$. If such a does not exist, then V is closely packed. Suppose otherwise. We denote by $s \in \overline{\mathrm{Sub}}_{\mathrm{o}}(t) \cap V^C$ the tree satisfying $a \in \mathrm{Root}(s)$.

(i) Suppose there exists $u \in \mathrm{MSub}(s)$ such that both $u \in V$ and $\overline{\mathrm{Sub}}_{\mathrm{o}}(u) \cap V \neq \overline{\mathrm{Sub}}_{\mathrm{o}}(u)$ are satisfied. Then $V_u = V \cap \overline{\mathrm{Sub}}(u)$ is not closely packed with respect to u. From the induction hypothesis, there exists $S_u \in \mathcal{B}(N)$ such that $S_u \subset \overline{\mathrm{Root}}(u), |S_u| = |\mathrm{Root}(V_u)|$ and $\sum_{i \in S_u} A_i < \sum_{i \in \mathrm{Root}(V_u)} A_i$. Now the assertion of the lemma follows on taking $S = (\mathrm{Root}(V) \setminus \mathrm{Root}(V_u)) \sqcup S_u$.

(ii) Suppose otherwise, i. e. for any $u \in \mathrm{MSub}(s)$ either $u \notin V$ or $\overline{\mathrm{Sub}}_{\mathrm{o}}(u) \subset V$ is satisfied.

   (a) Suppose $\overline{\mathrm{Sub}}_{\mathrm{o}}(u) \subset V$ is satisfied for any $u \in \mathrm{MSub}(s)$. This implies that $\overline{\mathrm{Sub}}_{\mathrm{e}}(s) \subset V$ or equivalently $\overline{\mathrm{Root}}_{\mathrm{e}}(s) \subset \mathrm{Root}(V)$. Let $r \in \overline{\mathrm{Sub}}_{\mathrm{e}}(t)$ be the tree that directly straddles s, and $q \in \overline{\mathrm{Sub}}_{\mathrm{o}}(t)$ be the one that directly straddles r. See Figure 7. We denote by P the branch point of q at which it straddles r. Note that $\mathrm{Ht}(P) = \mathrm{Ht}(r)$. Let q_1 be the subtree of q that extends downwardly from P and is adjacent to r on its left side. By the definition of a we have $\overline{\mathrm{Root}}_{\mathrm{o}}(q_1) \subset \mathrm{Root}(V)$. Define $S \in \mathcal{B}(N)$ as

$$S = \{\mathrm{Root}(V) \setminus (\overline{\mathrm{Root}}_{\mathrm{o}}(q_1) \sqcup \overline{\mathrm{Root}}_{\mathrm{e}}(s))\} \sqcup (\overline{\mathrm{Root}}_{\mathrm{e}}(q_1) \sqcup \overline{\mathrm{Root}}_{\mathrm{o}}(s)). \tag{45}$$

   Then by Lemmas 22 and 23 we have $\sum_{i \in \mathrm{Root}(V)} A_i - \sum_{i \in S} A_i \geq \mathrm{Ht}(P) - \mathrm{Ht}(s) > 0$.

   (b) Suppose otherwise, i. e. there exists $s' \in \mathrm{MSub}(s)$ such that $s' \notin V$. Replace s by s' and repeat the above arguments. Since the order of the nesting is finite, this case (ii)b cannot repeat endlessly, and we will eventually arrive at case (i) or (ii)a. The proof is completed.

□

3.5. Forest Realization Lemma

Given a state of the trop p-Toda $A = (A_1, \ldots, A_{2N})$, there are generally more than one $B^* \in \mathcal{B}(k, N)$ which satisfy the condition $\min_{B \in \mathcal{B}(k,N)} \left\{\sum_{i \in B} A_i\right\} = \sum_{i \in B^*} A_i$. We want to show that it is always possible to find such B^* that can be realized as the set of all the bottom points of a *forest*, a set of trees in Φ_A.

Example 25 *Consider Example 11 with $k = 4$. One can take $B^* = \{4, 6, 8, 10\}, \{5, 7, 9, 11\}, \{3, 5, 7, 9\}$ or $\{4, 6, 9, 11\}$. In Figure 5 one finds that the former two are not realized by forests, but the latter two are.*



Figure 7. Nested trees q, r, s for the proof of Lemma 24, case (ii)a.

Lemma 26 *For any* $1 \leq k \leq N$ *there exists* $T \subset \boldsymbol{Tree}(\Phi_A)$ *such that both* $\mathrm{Root}(T) \in \mathcal{B}(k,N)$ *and*

$$\min_{B \in \mathcal{B}(k,N)} \left\{ \sum_{i \in B} A_i \right\} = \sum_{i \in \mathrm{Root}(T)} A_i, \tag{46}$$

are satisfied.

Proof. Recall that Φ_A is a graph associated with $A = (A_1, \ldots, A_{2N})$. It is composed of several connected components called trees. We denote by $N(\Phi_A)$ the set of all nodes of Φ_A. It is the set of top points, bottom points, and branching points of the trees in Φ_A. In the same way, we denote by $L(\Phi_A)$ the set of all links of Φ_A. Note that, a top point has only a downward link, a bottom point has only an upward link, and a branching point has an upward and several downward links outgoing from it.

Choose any $B^* \in \mathcal{B}(k,N)$ that satisfies

$$\min_{B \in \mathcal{B}(k,N)} \left\{ \sum_{i \in B} A_i \right\} = \sum_{i \in B^*} A_i. \tag{47}$$

We draw a subgraph of Φ_A associated with B^*, that is denoted by $\Phi_A(B^*)$ and is defined as follows. First we adopt the bottom points $\{A_i\}_{i \in B^*}$ as elements of $N(\Phi_A(B^*))$, and adopt the links connected to them as those of $L(\Phi_A(B^*))$. We also adopt the nodes at the other end of these links as elements of $N(\Phi_A(B^*))$. If such an adopted node is a branching point of Φ_A, then there are two cases to be distinguished.

(i) Filled branching point: all its downward links are adopted ones.

(ii) Unfilled branching point: some of its downward links are unadopted ones.

If there is a filled branching point, we also adopt its upward link and the node at the other end as elements of $L(\Phi_A(B^*))$ and $N(\Phi_A(B^*))$. Repeat this procedure as much as possible, and let $\Phi_A(B^*)$ be the graph obtained finally. If all the branching points in $\Phi_A(B^*)$ are filled ones, then there exists $T \subset \boldsymbol{Tree}(\Phi_A)$ such that $B^* = \mathrm{Root}(T)$. Hence we are done.

Suppose otherwise. It is enough to show that there exists a procedure for finding a $C^* \in \mathcal{B}(k, N)$ such that the number of unfilled branching points in $\Phi_A(C^*)$ is smaller than the number of those in $\Phi_A(B^*)$ by one, under the condition $\sum_{i \in C^*} A_i = \sum_{i \in B^*} A_i$. The claim of the lemma follows from using this procedure repeatedly. Now we start describing such a procedure. We denote by P an arbitrary chosen unfilled branching point in $\Phi_A(B^*)$ with lowest height, and by $q \in \mathrm{Tree}(\Phi_A)$ the tree wherein P lies. By definition, there are both adopted and unadopted subtrees of q under P. It is enough to show that there exists a way to reduce the number of the adopted subtrees without changing the other conditions.

Among those subtrees, choose an adjacent pair of adopted/unadopted subtrees q_1, q_2. See Figure 8 for an example. Then, there is an unadopted tree $r \in \mathrm{MSub}(q)$ under P between q_1 and q_2. By Lemma 24 and since there is no unfilled branching point under P one sees that $\overline{\mathrm{Sub}}(q_1) \cap \Phi_A(B^*)$ must be closely packed with respect to q_1, because otherwise (47) is not satisfied.



Figure 8. An unfilled branching point P lies in the tree q. Thick lines are adopted links, and thin lines are unadopted ones.

Let $B_1^* = (\overline{\mathrm{Root}}(q_1) \sqcup \overline{\mathrm{Root}}(r)) \cap B^*$. Then $B_1^* = \overline{\mathrm{Root}}_{\mathrm{o}}(q_1) \sqcup \mathrm{Root}(V)$ with some $V \subset \mathrm{Sub}(r)$. We are to show that there exists a $C_1^* \in \mathcal{B}(N)$ satisfying

$$|C_1^*| = |B_1^*|, \qquad \sum_{i \in C_1^*} A_i = \sum_{i \in B_1^*} A_i, \tag{48}$$

and can be written as $C_1^* = \mathrm{Root}(V')$ with some $V' \subset \mathrm{Sub}(q_1) \sqcup \overline{\mathrm{Sub}}(r) \subset \boldsymbol{Tree}(\Phi_A)$.

(i) Suppose there exists $s \in \mathrm{MSub}(r)$ such that both $s \in V$ and $\overline{\mathrm{Sub}}_{\mathrm{o}}(s) \cap V \neq \overline{\mathrm{Sub}}_{\mathrm{o}}(s)$ are satisfied. See Figure 9 (Left) for an example. Then $V_s = V \cap \overline{\mathrm{Sub}}(s)$ is not closely packed with respect to s. By Lemma 24 one finds that this case cannot happen because otherwise (47) is not satisfied.

(ii) Suppose otherwise, i. e. for any $s \in \mathrm{MSub}(r)$ either $s \notin V$ or $\overline{\mathrm{Sub}}_{\mathrm{o}}(s) \subset V$ is satisfied.

(a) Suppose $\overline{\mathrm{Sub}}_{\mathrm{o}}(s) \subset V$ is satisfied for any $s \in \mathrm{MSub}(r)$. See Figure 9 (Middle). This implies that $\overline{\mathrm{Sub}}_{\mathrm{e}}(r) = V$, hence $B_1^* = \overline{\mathrm{Root}}_{\mathrm{o}}(q_1) \sqcup \overline{\mathrm{Root}}_{\mathrm{e}}(r)$. Let $C_1^* = \overline{\mathrm{Root}}_{\mathrm{e}}(q_1) \sqcup \overline{\mathrm{Root}}_{\mathrm{o}}(r)$. Then $|C_1^*| = |B_1^*|$ and by Lemmas 22, 23 we have

$$\sum_{i \in C_1^*} A_i - \sum_{i \in B_1^*} A_i \leq \mathrm{Ht}(r) - \mathrm{Ht}(P) = 0. \tag{49}$$

The inequality case is excluded because otherwise (47) is not satisfied.

(b) Suppose otherwise, i. e. there exists $r' \in \mathrm{MSub}(r)$ such that $r' \notin V$. See Figure 9 (Right). Replace r by r' and repeat the above arguments. Since the order of the nesting is finite, this case (ii)b cannot repeat endlessly, and we will eventually arrive at case (i) or (ii)a. The case (i) has already been excluded. The case (ii)a can be also excluded because now we have $\mathrm{Ht}(r') - \mathrm{Ht}(P) < 0$ instead of the right equality of (49). Thus one finds neither case can happen.



Figure 9. (Left) case (i); (Middle) case (ii)a; (Right) case (ii)b

To summarize, the only possible case is (ii)a, under the condition that the equality in (49) holds. Then by changing B^* by $(B^* \setminus B_1^*) \sqcup C_1^*$ one can reduce the number of adopted subtrees under P by one without changing the other conditions. The proof is completed.

□

4. A continuous analogue of Kerov-Kirillov-Reshetikhin bijection

4.1. A map from highest weight paths to rigged configurations

The Kerov-Kirillov-Reshetkhin (KKR) bijection is a bijection between the set of tensor products of crystals [21] and the set of a combinatorial objects known as rigged

configurations. In this section we consider a continuous analogue of KKR map in $\mathfrak{sl}_2$ case to explain the backgrounds of our algorithm in §2.4.

Given $L > 0$, let $\mathcal{P}_+ = \coprod_{N=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{P}_{+,N}$ where

$$\mathcal{P}_{+,N} = \left\{ (x_1, \ldots, x_{2N}) \in (\mathbb{R}_{>0})^{2N} \middle| \sum_{i=1}^{2N} x_i \leq L, \sum_{i=1}^{k} (x_{2i-1} - x_{2i}) \geq 0 \,\text{for}\, 1 \leq k \leq N \right\}, \tag{50}$$

and $\mathcal{M} = \coprod_{s=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{M}_s$ where

$$\mathcal{M}_s = \left\{ \lambda = (l_j, m_j)_{1 \leq j \leq s} \in (\mathbb{R}_{>0} \times \mathbb{Z}_{>0})^s \middle| l_1 > \cdots > l_s, \sum_{i=1}^{s} l_i m_i \leq L/2 \right\}. \tag{51}$$

Each element of the set $\mathcal{M}_s$ is depicted as a Young diagram with area $\leq L/2$.

For $\lambda \in \mathcal{M}_s$ define its jth vacancy number $p_j(\lambda)$ as

$$p_j(\lambda) = L - 2 \sum_{k=1}^{s} \min(l_j, l_k) m_k. \tag{52}$$

Also we define the set of quantum numbers or riggings $\mathrm{Rig}(\lambda)$ associated with λ as

$$\mathrm{Rig}(\lambda) = \left\{ (J_i^{(j)})_{1 \leq i \leq m_j, 1 \leq j \leq s} \in \mathbb{R}^{m_1 + \cdots + m_s} \middle| 0 \leq J_1^{(j)} \leq \cdots \leq J_{m_j}^{(j)} \leq p_j(\lambda) \,\text{for}\, 1 \leq j \leq s \right\}. \tag{53}$$

Let $\mathrm{Rig} = \coprod_{\lambda \in \mathcal{M}} \mathrm{Rig}(\lambda)$.

Given $L > 0$ we define a pair of maps $\phi_1 : \mathcal{P}_+ \to \mathcal{M}$ and $\phi_2 : \mathcal{P}_+ \to \mathrm{Rig}$, such that $\phi = (\phi_1, \phi_2)$ gives a bijection $\phi : \mathcal{P}_+ \to \bigsqcup_{\lambda \in \mathcal{M}} \{\lambda\} \times \mathrm{Rig}(\lambda)$.

4.2. The map ϕ_1

In order to adjust the values of the quantum numbers to conventional ones, we slightly modify the algorithm in §2.4 by replacing item (iii) there by the following:

- Suppose the last sequence of $n_{k^{(i)}}^{(i)}$ zeros is at the right end after a positive neighbor a as $\ldots, a, 0, \ldots, 0$. Remove these zeros. If $n_{k^{(i)}}^{(i)}$ is odd then also remove a.

We define the map $\phi_1 : \mathcal{P}_+ \to \mathcal{M}$ by the algorithm in §2.4 with this modification. Given the A-variables satisfying the highest weight condition, the Young diagram $\tilde{\lambda}$ constructed by the algorithm in §2.4 does not change under this modification. To be clearer we call the algorithm in §2.4 algorithm-I, and the one in this section algorithm-II. Then we have:

Proposition 27 *The Young diagram constructed by algorithm-I is equal to the one by algorithm-II.*

Proof. To distinguish cases, we denote by $x^{(i)}(X), y^{(i)}(X)$ the sequences $x^{(i)}, y^{(i)}$ constructed by algorithm-X($= I$ or II). By induction on i, it is easy to see that both

algorithms preserve the highest weight condition, and that the lengths of the sequences are the same in both algorithms. It is also easy to see that $x_1^{(i)}(I) \geq x_1^{(i)}(II), y_1^{(i)}(I) \geq y_1^{(i)}(II)$, and $x_j^{(i)}(I) = x_j^{(i)}(II), y_j^{(i)}(I) = y_j^{(i)}(II)$ for $j > 1$. This implies that the set of numbers $\{(\mu^{(i)}, \nu^{(i)})\}_{1 \leq i \leq s}$ constructed by both algorithms are the same. □

By this fact and Theorem 13, we see that ϕ_1 is a map that yields the conserved quantities of trop p-Toda.

Example 28 *For the same state in Example 12 we have:*

$$\begin{aligned} x^{(1)} &= (4,3,3,2,2,1,1,1), \\ y^{(1)} &= (3,2,2,1,1,0,0,0), \\ x^{(2)} &= (3,2,2,1), \\ y^{(2)} &= (2,1,1,0), \\ x^{(3)} &= (2,1), \\ y^{(3)} &= (1,0), \end{aligned}$$

and $\mu^{(1)} = \mu^{(2)} = \mu^{(3)} = 1, \nu^{(1)} = 2, \nu^{(2)} = \nu^{(3)} = 1$.

The image of $\mathcal{P}_+$ by the map ϕ_1 is indeed in $\mathcal{M}$.

Lemma 29 $\phi_1(\mathcal{P}_+) \subset \mathcal{M}$.

Proof. It suffices to show that the condition $\sum_{i=1}^{2N} x_i \leq L$ in (50) leads to the condition $\sum_{i=1}^{s} l_i m_i \leq L/2$ in (51). It is done by using the relations $y_j^{(i)} = x_j^{(i)} - \mu^{(i)}$ and $\sum_{j=1}^{2N^{(i+1)}} x_j^{(i+1)} \leq \sum_{j=1}^{2N^{(i)}} y_j^{(i)}$ as $L \geq \sum_{j=1}^{2N^{(1)}} x_j^{(1)} = 2N^{(1)}\mu^{(1)} + \sum_{j=1}^{2N^{(1)}} y_j^{(1)} \geq 2\sum_{i=1}^{s} N^{(i)}\mu^{(i)} + \sum_{j=1}^{2N^{(s)}} y_j^{(s)} \geq 2\sum_{i=1}^{s} N^{(i)}\mu^{(i)} = 2\sum_{i=1}^{s} l_i m_i$. □

4.3. The map ϕ_2

Consider the algorithm in §2.4 with the modification in §4.2. With the ith block $(\mu^{(i)}, \nu^{(i)})$ of the Young diagram $\tilde{\lambda}$ we associate $\nu^{(i)}$ non-negative real numbers called quantum numbers. Recall that in the array of non-negative real numbers $y_1^{(i)}, \ldots, y_{2N^{(i)}}^{(i)}$ we have $k^{(i)}$ sequences of zeros, and the jth sequence has $n_j^{(i)}$ zeros. Denote by $I_j^{(i)}$ the position of the first element of the jth sequence. Let $r_j^{(i)} = \sum_{l=1}^{I_j^{(i)}-1} y_l^{(i)}$. Then the $\nu^{(i)}$ quantum numbers for the ith block are defined as

$$\underbrace{r_1^{(i)} \ldots r_1^{(i)}}_{\sigma_1^{(i)}} \underbrace{r_2^{(i)} \ldots r_2^{(i)}}_{\sigma_2^{(i)}} \cdots \underbrace{r_{k^{(i)}}^{(i)} \ldots r_{k^{(i)}}^{(i)}}_{\sigma_{k^{(i)}}^{(i)}}, \tag{54}$$

where $\sigma_j^{(i)} = \lceil n_j^{(i)}/2 \rceil$. Note that $r_j^{(i)} < r_k^{(i)}$ for $j < k$. Given any positive real number L satisfying $\sum_{j=1}^{2N} x_i \leq L$, let $\lambda^{(j)} = \sum_{k=1}^{j} \mu^{(k)}$ and

$$q_j(\lambda) = L - 2\sum_{k=1}^{s} \min(\lambda^{(j)}, \lambda^{(k)})\nu^{(k)}, \tag{55}$$

for $1 \leq j \leq s$. By Theorem 13, we have $\lambda^{(s+1-j)} = l_j, \nu^{(s+1-j)} = m_j$, and $q_{s+1-j}(\lambda) = p_j(\lambda)$.

By the following lemma, one sees that the quantum numbers for the ith block obey the condition $0 \leq r_j^{(i)} \leq q_i(\lambda)$. This enables us to define the map $\phi_2 : \mathcal{P}_+ \to \mathrm{Rig}$ by the procedure described above and by identifying the $m_{s+1-i} = \nu^{(i)}$ quantum numbers in (54) with $J_1^{(s+1-i)}, \ldots, J_{m_{s+1-i}}^{(s+1-i)}$ for $1 \leq i \leq s$ in (53).

Lemma 30 $\phi_2(\mathcal{P}_+) \subset \mathrm{Rig}$.

Proof. By definition, the relation $0 \leq r_j^{(i)}$ holds trivially. Let $L_0 = L - \sum_{j=1}^{2N} x_i$. It suffices to show that the relation $\sum_{j=1}^{2N^{(i)}} y_j^{(i)} \leq q_i(\lambda) - L_0$ is satisfied for $1 \leq i \leq s$ by induction on i, since then we have $r_j^{(i)} \leq \sum_{j=1}^{2N^{(i)}} y_j^{(i)} \leq q_i(\lambda)$. It is done by using the relations in the proof of Lemma 29 as well as the relation $q_j(\lambda) = q_{j-1}(\lambda) - 2\mu^{(j)}N^{(j)}$ where $q_0(\lambda) = L$. □

Example 31 *For the A-variables in Example 11 the quantum numbers for the first block of the Young diagram are* $3\sqrt{2}-1, 3\sqrt{2}-1, 4\sqrt{2}-2$*, those for the second are* $2, 2$*, and that for the third is* $3\sqrt{2}-4$.

4.4. The inverse map

Having obtained the pair $\phi = (\phi_1, \phi_2)$ that gives a map $\phi : \mathcal{P}_+ \to \bigsqcup_{\lambda \in \mathcal{M}} \{\lambda\} \times \mathrm{Rig}(\lambda)$, now we consider its inverse map ϕ^{-1}. This is done by using the inverse of the algorithm in §2.4 with the modification in §4.2. Let $\lambda = (l_j, m_j)_{1 \leq j \leq s} \in \mathcal{M}_s$ and $J = (J_i^{(j)})_{1 \leq i \leq m_j, 1 \leq j \leq s} \in \mathrm{Rig}(\lambda)$. By the correspondence in the previous subsection, we regard λ as $\lambda = \{(\mu^{(i)}, \nu^{(i)})\}_{1 \leq i \leq s}$, and J as $J = \{(r_j^{(i)})^{\sigma_j^{(i)}}\}_{1 \leq j \leq k^{(i)}, 1 \leq i \leq s} \in \mathrm{Rig}(\lambda)$ where $\sigma_j^{(i)}$ is the multiplicity of $r_j^{(i)}$. The quantum numbers obey the condition $0 \leq r_1^{(i)} < \cdots < r_{k^{(i)}}^{(i)} \leq q_i(\lambda)$ where $q_i(\lambda)$ is the vacancy number defined by (55). Given (λ, J), its image $x^{(1)} = (x_1^{(1)}, \ldots, x_{2N^{(1)}}^{(1)})$ under the map ϕ^{-1} is given by such a step-by-step construction as $y^{(s)} \to x^{(s)} \to y^{(s-1)} \to x^{(s-1)} \to \cdots \to y^{(1)} \to x^{(1)}$. The first step goes as follows. Let

$$\underbrace{r_1^{(s)} \ldots r_1^{(s)}}_{\sigma_1^{(s)}} \underbrace{r_2^{(s)} \ldots r_2^{(s)}}_{\sigma_2^{(s)}} \cdots \underbrace{r_{k^{(s)}}^{(s)} \ldots r_{k^{(s)}}^{(s)}}_{\sigma_{k^{(s)}}^{(s)}}$$

be the $\nu^{(s)}$ quantum numbers for the s-th (top) block. We define a sequence of non-negative real numbers $y_1^{(s)}, \ldots, y_{2N^{(s)}}^{(s)}$ as

$$r_1^{(s)}, \underbrace{0, \ldots, 0}_{2\sigma_1^{(s)}-1}, r_2^{(s)} - r_1^{(s)}, \underbrace{0, \ldots, 0}_{2\sigma_2^{(s)}-1}, \ldots, r_{k^{(s)}}^{(s)} - r_{k^{(s)}-1}^{(s)}, \underbrace{0, \ldots, 0}_{2\sigma_{k^{(s)}}^{(s)}-1}.$$

Then we define a sequence of positive real numbers $x_1^{(s)}, \ldots, x_{2N^{(s)}}^{(s)}$ by $x_j^{(s)} = y_j^{(s)} + \mu^{(s)}$.

The subsequent steps go as follows. Given $x_1^{(i+1)}, \ldots, x_{2N^{(i+1)}}^{(i+1)}$ and the quantum numbers in (54), we define a sequence of non-negative real numbers $y_1^{(i)}, \ldots, y_{2N^{(i)}}^{(i)}$ by

the following way. Let $w_k^{(i+1)} = \sum_{j=1}^{k} x_j^{(i+1)}$ for $1 \leq k \leq 2N^{(i+1)}$ and $w_0^{(i+1)} = 0$. For each $r_j^{(i)}$ either $w_k^{(i+1)} \leq r_j^{(i)} < w_{k+1}^{(i+1)}$ for some $0 \leq k \leq 2N^{(i+1)}-1$ or $r_j^{(i)} \geq w_{2N^{(i+1)}}^{(i+1)}$ is satisfied. Roughly speaking, we split $x_{k+1}^{(i+1)}$ and insert some zeros in the former case, while in the the latter case we append $r_j^{(i)} - w_{2N^{(i+1)}}^{(i+1)}$ and some zeros at the end of the sequence. To be more precise, let us consider the case $w_k^{(i+1)} \leq r_j^{(i)} < r_{j+1}^{(i)} < w_{k+1}^{(i+1)}$ and the case $r_{k^{(i)}}^{(i)} > r_{k^{(i)}-1}^{(i)} \geq w_{2N^{(i+1)}}^{(i+1)}$ as examples, where we assumed no other $r_l^{(i)}$'s exist in the (half-)intervals determined by $w_k^{(i+1)}$'s. In the former case we replace $x_{k+1}^{(i+1)} = w_{k+1}^{(i+1)} - w_k^{(i+1)}$ by

$$r_j^{(i)} - w_k^{(i+1)}, \underbrace{0, \ldots, 0}_{2\sigma_j^{(i)}-1}, r_{j+1}^{(i)} - r_j^{(i)}, \underbrace{0, \ldots, 0}_{2\sigma_{j+1}^{(i)}-1}, w_{k+1}^{(i+1)} - r_{j+1}^{(i)}.$$

In the latter case we add the following sequence after $x_{2N^{(i+1)}}^{(i+1)}$:

$$r_{k^{(i)}-1}^{(i)} - w_{2N^{(i+1)}}^{(i+1)}, \underbrace{0, \ldots, 0}_{2\sigma_{k^{(i)}-1}^{(i)}-1}, r_{k^{(i)}}^{(i)} - r_{k^{(i)}-1}^{(i)}, \underbrace{0, \ldots, 0}_{2\sigma_{k^{(i)}}^{(i)}-1}.$$

It is easy to generalize these procedures for the cases where any number of different values of the quantum numbers exist in the (half-)intervals determined by $w_k^{(i+1)}$'s . Then we define a sequence of positive real numbers $x_1^{(i)}, \ldots, x_{2N^{(i)}}^{(i)}$ by $x_j^{(i)} = y_j^{(i)} + \mu^{(i)}$.

Given $\lambda = \{(\mu^{(i)}, \nu^{(i)})\}_{1 \leq i \leq s} \in \mathcal{M}_s$ and $J = \{(r_j^{(i)})^{\sigma_j^{(i)}}\}_{1 \leq j \leq k^{(i)}, 1 \leq i \leq s} \in \mathrm{Rig}(\lambda)$, we define the map ϕ^{-1} by $\phi^{-1}(\lambda, J) = (x_1^{(1)}, \ldots, x_{2N^{(1)}}^{(1)})$. By construction, we see that it is indeed the inverse of the map ϕ. Moreover we have the following:

Lemma 32 $\phi^{-1}(\bigsqcup_{\lambda \in \mathcal{M}} \{\lambda\} \times \mathrm{Rig}(\lambda)) \subset \mathcal{P}_+$.

Proof. From Lemma 10 we see that the above algorithm for ϕ^{-1} preserves the highest weight condition. Hence it suffices to show that $w_{2N^{(1)}}^{(1)} := \sum_{j=1}^{2N^{(1)}} x_j^{(1)} \leq L$. To begin with, we prove $\sum_{j=1}^{2N^{(i)}} y_j^{(i)} \leq q_i(\lambda)$ for $1 \leq i \leq s$. For $i = s$, it is satisfied as $\sum_{j=1}^{2N^{(s)}} y_j^{(s)} = r_{k^{(s)}}^{(s)} \leq q_s(\lambda)$. Suppose $\sum_{j=1}^{2N^{(i+1)}} y_j^{(i+1)} \leq q_{i+1}(\lambda)$ for some $i < s$. Then we have $w_{2N^{(i+1)}}^{(i+1)} = \sum_{j=1}^{2N^{(i+1)}} y_j^{(i+1)} + 2N^{(i+1)}\mu^{(i+1)} \leq q_{i+1}(\lambda) + 2N^{(i+1)}\mu^{(i+1)} = q_i(\lambda)$, and hence $\sum_{j=1}^{2N^{(i)}} y_j^{(i)} = \max\{w_{2N^{(i+1)}}^{(i+1)}, r_{k^{(i)}}^{(i)}\} \leq q_i(\lambda)$. Thus by descending induction on i this inequality holds for any $1 \leq i \leq s$. Now we obtain the desired result as $w_{2N^{(1)}}^{(1)} = \sum_{j=1}^{2N^{(1)}} y_j^{(1)} + 2N^{(1)}\mu^{(1)} \leq q_1(\lambda) + 2N^{(1)}\mu^{(1)} = q_0(\lambda) = L$. □

By Lemmas 29, 30 and 32 we obtain the following result.

Theorem 33 *The map* $\phi : \mathcal{P}_+ \to \bigsqcup_{\lambda \in \mathcal{M}} \{\lambda\} \times \mathrm{Rig}(\lambda)$ *is a bijection.*

So far we do not know whether one can regard this bijection as an isomorphism, i. e. we do not know what kind of mathematical structures are preserved under this bijection.

5. Concluding remarks

In this paper we elucidated combinatorial aspects of the conserved quantities of general tropical periodic Toda lattice beyond the generic condition. Let us summarize what we

have done. The evolution equation of this dynamical system was given by (17), and the conserved quantities were written as in (20). We proved that the conserved quantities are related by a weak convexity condition (Theorem 9), which enables us to write the set of conserved quantities as a Young diagram in Figure 3. After introducing an algorithm related to the Kelov-Kirillov-Reshetikhin (KKR) bijection to construct another Young diagram in Figure 4, we presented our main result (Theorem 13) saying the identification of these Young diagrams. We gave a detailed proof of this theorem and a discussion on the KKR bijection in the subsequent sections.

The idea of our proof is based on [16], but not a straightforward extension. From our interpretation, there are several ambiguous and/or incorrect descriptions in Appendix A. 1 of [16]. To make our proof mathematically rigorous, we devise our own tools. The followings are two of them. (i) In §3.1 we devised our original rule to draw lines in a graph when more than two consecutive $\times$'s appear in a given level. In the 10-elimination algorithm for pBBS this corresponds to simultaneous disappearance of more than two consecutive blocks, for which the rule to draw lines was ambiguous in [16]. (ii) We formulated our original lemmas in §3.4 and §3.5. Here we explain the latter one. From our interpretation, equation (A. 13) of [16] claims that *any* B^* in (47) *must* be realized by a forest, on which their proof substantially depend. But as we have shown in Example 25 this claim is not true. The correct statement is that *at least one* B^* in (47) *can* be realized by a forest, as we proved in §3.5.

In the original (discrete) KKR bijection in $\mathfrak{sl}_2$ case [17] the set $\mathcal{P}_+$ is a subset of the tensor product of crystals $B^{\otimes L}$ with $B = \{1, 2\}$ and its elements are expressed as

$$\underbrace{1\dots1}_{x_1}\underbrace{2\dots2}_{x_2}\cdots\underbrace{1\dots1}_{x_{2N-1}}\underbrace{2\dots2}_{x_{2N}}\underbrace{1\dots1}_{x_{2N+1}}$$

for some N with the condition in (50), where we omitted $\otimes$ symbols. In our algorithm the integer x_i's here have been replaced by continuous variables taking their values in real numbers. Actually our algorithm is based on the algorithm in [14] which is a variation of the original algorithm. In $\mathfrak{sl}_{n+1}$ case the set B is replaced by $B = \{1, \dots, n+1\}$ and the highest weight condition is adequately modified. The algorithm of the KKR bijection for $\mathfrak{sl}_{n+1}$ case was given in §3.2 of [3]. In this case no analogues of the above mentioned variation in $\mathfrak{sl}_2$ case has been developed yet. Therefore a promising way to construct a continuous analogue of the KKR bijection for $\mathfrak{sl}_{n+1}$ is to develop such a variation first. Then the remaining task will be rather straightforward.

Finally we would like to explain the difference of the arguments between [17] and the present work. In [17] the conservation of the Young diagram under the time evolution of pBBS was shown by the following way. For any positive integer l and any state p, we introduced a time evolution $T_l(p)$ and an energy $E_l(p)$ (Proposition 2.1) by using the crystal theory and its energy function. Then the conservation of the energy $E_l(T_k(p)) = E_l(p)$ and the commutativity of the time evolutions $T_lT_k(p) = T_kT_l(p)$ were shown (Theorem 2.2). Finally we proved that the data carried by the whole set of the values of the energy $E_l(p)\,(l = 1, 2, \dots)$ was equivalent to the Young diagram

constructed by KKR map (Proposition 3.4). In the present work the author did not try to generalize this argument to trop p-Toda case, because the crystal theory and its energy function have not been developed in this case. Therefore no counterpart of the above construction of $E_l(p)$ can be allocated in the present paper. However, the author thinks that one can generalize the above argument to trop p-Toda case because the arguments in [4] to construct a commuting family of time evolutions may be used to develop an analogue of the energy function in this case. We hope to report any progress on this subject in the near future.

Acknowledgement. This work was supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number 25400122.

[1] Toda M 1981 *Theory of nonlinear lattices* (Springer-Verlag: Berlin-New York)
[2] Athorne C, Maclagan D and Strachan I (ed) 2012 *Tropical Geometry and Integrable Systems* (Contemporary Math **580**) (Providence, Rhode Island: American Mathematical Society)
[3] Inoue R, Kuniba A and Takagi T 2012 Integrable structure of box-ball systems: crystal, Bethe ansatz, ultradiscretization and tropical geometry, J. Phys. A **45**, 073001 (63 pages)
[4] Takagi T 2012 Commuting time evolutions in the tropical periodic Toda lattice, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **81**, 104005 (7 pages)
[5] Inoue R and Iwao S 2012 Tropical curves and integrable piecewise linear maps, Contemporary Math. **580**, 21–39
[6] Kimijima T and Tokihiro T 2002 Initial-value problem of the discrete periodic Toda equations and its ultradiscretization, Inverse Problems **18** 1705–1732
[7] Inoue R and Takenawa T 2008 Tropical spectral curves and integrable cellular automata, Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN, no. 9, rnn019 (27 pages)
[8] Inoue R and Takenawa T 2009 A tropical analogue of Fay's trisecant identity and the ultra-discrete periodic Toda lattice, Comm. Math. Phys., **289**, 995–1021
[9] Berenstein A and Kazhdan D 2000 Geometric and unipotent crystals, in *Visions in Mathematics, GAFA 2000 Special Volume, Part I,* eds. N. Alon, J. Bourgain, A. Connes, M. Gromov, and V. Milman, (Birkhäuser: Basel), 188–236
[10] Itenberg I, Mikhalkin G and Shustin E 2009 *Tropical Algebraic Geometry* (Birkhäuser: Basel)
[11] Maclagan D 2012 Introduction to tropical algebraic geometry, Contemporary Math. **580**, 1–19
[12] Kerov S V, Kirillov A N and Reshetikhin N Yu 1988 Combinatorics, the Bethe ansatz and representations of the symmetric group. J. Soviet Math. **41** 916–924
[13] Kirillov A N and Reshetikhin N Yu 1988 The Bethe ansatz and the combinatorics of Young tableaux, J. Soviet Math. **41** 925–955
[14] Takagi T 2005 Inverse scattering method for a soliton cellular automaton, Nucl. Phys. B **707** 577–601
[15] Yoshihara D, Yura F and Tokihiro T 2003 Fundamental cycle of a periodic box-ball system, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. **36** 99–121
[16] Iwao S and Tokihiro T 2007, Ultradiscretization of the theta function solution of pd Toda, J. Phys. A **40**, 12987–13021
[17] Kuniba A Takagi T and Takenouchi A 2006 Bethe ansatz and inverse scattering transform in a periodic box-ball system Nucl. Phys. B **747** [PM] 354–397
[18] Takagi T 2010 Level set structure of an integrable cellular automaton, SIGMA, 6, 027, 18 pages
[19] Arnold V I 1989 *Mathematical Methods of Classical Mechanics* (New York: Springer-Verlag) 2nd ed, p. 287
[20] Tokihiro T 2010 *Mathematics of box-ball systems* (Tokyo: Asakura Shoten) [in Japanese]
[21] Kashiwara M 1991 On crystal bases of q-analogue of universal enveloping algebras, Duke Math. J.

63, 465–516